arXiv:1612.05342v1 [math.NA] 16 Dec 2016

Enumeration of the Chebyshev-Frolov lattice points in axis-parallel boxes*

Kosuke Suzuki†, Takehito Yoshiki‡

December 19, 2016

Abstract

For a positive integer d, the d-dimensional Chebyshev-Frolov lattice is the $\mathbb{Z}$-lattice in $\mathbb{R}^d$ generated by the Vandermonde matrix associated to the roots of the d-dimensional Chebyshev polynomial. It is important to enumerate the points from the Chebyshev-Frolov lattices in axis-parallel boxes when $d = 2^n$ for a non-negative integer n, since the points are used for the nodes of Frolov's cubature formula, which achieves the optimal rate of convergence for many spaces of functions with bounded mixed derivatives and compact support. The existing enumeration algorithm for such points by Kacwin, Oettershagen and Ullrich is efficient up to dimension $d = 16$. In this paper we suggest a new enumeration algorithm of such points for $d = 2^n$, efficient up to $d = 32$.

1 Introduction

Let d be a positive integer and $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a d-dimensional lattice, i.e., there exists an invertible $d \times d$ matrix T over $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mathbb{X} = T(\mathbb{Z}^d) = \{T\boldsymbol{k} \mid \boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}.$$

The lattice $\mathbb{X}$ is said to be admissible if

$$\min\left\{\prod_{i=1}^{d} |x_i| \;\middle|\; (x_1, \ldots, x_d)^\top \in \mathbb{X} \setminus \{\boldsymbol{0}\}\right\} > 0.$$

Using an admissible lattice $\mathbb{X} = T(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, Frolov's cubature formula approximates the integration value

$$I(f) := \int_{[-1/2,1/2]^d} f(\boldsymbol{x})\, d\boldsymbol{x}$$

*The research of the authors was supported under the Australian Research Councils Discovery Projects funding scheme (project number DP150101770).

†School of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia, e-mail: kosuke.suzuki1@unsw.edu.au

‡School of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia, e-mail: takehito.yoshiki1@unsw.edu.au

of a function $f\colon [-1/2,1/2]^d \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$Q_{a^{-1}T}(f) = |\det(a^{-1}T)| \sum_{x \in a^{-1}\mathbb{X} \cap [-1/2,1/2]^d} f(\boldsymbol{x}) \quad \text{for } a \geq 1. \tag{1}$$

Thus the nodes are the shrunk lattice points $a^{-1}\mathbb{X}$ inside the box $[-1/2,1/2]^d$. Frolov's cubature formula is first proposed by Frolov [4] and has been studied in many papers, see [1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. One prominent feature of the formula is that it achieves the optimal rate of convergence for various spaces of functions with bounded mixed derivatives and compact support. This means that the approximation is automatically good, even without knowing specific information of integrands. The constraint of compact supportness can be removed using some modification, see [8].

The implementation of Frolov's cubature formula requires to enumerate the points in the set $a^{-1}\mathbb{X} \cap [-1/2,1/2]^d$, or equivalently, the points in the set $\mathbb{X} \cap [-a/2,a/2]^d$. However the enumeration is a difficult task even in moderate dimensions. Recently, an efficient enumeration algorithm for the so-called Chebyshev-Frolov lattices up to $d = 16$ was suggested by Kacwin, Oettershagen and Ullrich [6]. Since the lattices are admissible when $d = 2^n$, it is possible to implement Frolov's cubature formula for $d = 2^n$, up to $d = 16$. Numerical experiments based on the algorithm are given in [5] and will be given in the forthcoming paper by the authors of [6] and Mario Ullrich. Our contribution in this paper is to suggest a new efficient enumeration algorithm for the Chebyshev-Frolov lattices for $d = 2^n$. It is efficient up to $d = 32$.

The Chebyshev-Frolov lattices for $d = 2^n$ are examples of admissible lattices, suggested by Temlyakov [10, IV.4]. Let P_d be a rescaled d-dimensional Chebyshev polynomial defined as

$$P_d(x) = 2\cos(d \arccos(x/2)) \quad \text{for } |x| < 2. \tag{2}$$

Its roots are given by

$$\zeta_{n,k} = 2\cos\left(\frac{\pi(2k-1)}{2d}\right), \quad k = 1, \dots, 2^n. \tag{3}$$

With these roots, we define a Vandermonde matrix T by

$$T = (\zeta_i^{j-1})_{i,j=1}^d.$$

Now the d-dimensional Chebyshev-Frolov lattice is defined as the lattice $T(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. It is known that the lattice $T(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ is admissible if and only if $d = 2^n$. This is a special case of a general construction method for admissible lattices for any d elaborated in [10], see also Section 2. An advantage of the Chebyshev-Frolov lattices is that the generating matrices are explicitly given.

We now briefly recall results in [6]. The paper established an enumeration algorithm of the lattice points in $[-a/2,a/2]^d$, for any orthogonal lattices. This is applicable to the Chebyshev-Frolov lattices as they are orthogonal. Their experiment shows that it is efficient up to $d = 16$. They further proved properties of the Chebyshev-Frolov lattices summarized as follows.

Theorem 1.1 ([6, Theorem 1.1]). *For any positive integer d, the d-dimensional Chebyshev-Frolov lattice $T(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ is orthogonal. In particular, there exists a lattice representation $\tilde{T} = TS$ with some $S \in SL_d(\mathbb{Z})$ such that*

- *For each component $t_{i,j}$ of $\tilde{T}$, it holds that $|t_{i,j}| \leq 2$.*
- *$\tilde{T}^\top \tilde{T} = diag(d, 2d, \ldots, 2d)$.*

Our algorithm is based on another property particular to the Chebyshev-Frolov lattices. Our key observation is that the 2^n-dimensional Chebyshev-Frolov lattice with a certain permutation of coordinates is generated by a matrix A_n which satisfies a recursive property as in (4). This property reduces the 2^n-dimensional enumeration to a number of 2^{n-1}-dimensional enumerations as in Lemma 3.3. By applying this repeatedly, finally the enumeration is reduced to nested 1-dimensional enumerations, which can be implemented as 2^n-folded for-loops. We will expose them in Section 3. We will show that our algorithm is efficient up to $d = 32$ in Section 5.

Another advantage of our algorithm is that it can enumerate the Chebyshev-Frolov lattice points in arbitrary axis-parallel boxes. This helps us to implement not only Frolov's cubature formula but also its randomization. Randomized Frolov's cubature formula was introduced by Krieg and Novak [7] and studied further by Ullrich [12]. It inherits the prominent convergence behavior of the deterministic version as well as it is unbiased. Further it also has the optimal order of convergence in the randomized sense for Sobolev spaces with isotropic and mixed smoothness. We will give how to enumerate the integration nodes of the deterministic and randomized versions with our algorithm in Section 4.

Throughout this paper we use the following notation. The symbols $\mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{R}$ denote the set of the non-negative integers, the integers, the rational numbers and the real numbers, respectively. For $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $(\boldsymbol{x}_1; \boldsymbol{x}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ denotes the vector where $\boldsymbol{x}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{x}_2$ are vertically connected. We denote $SL_d(\mathbb{Z})$ the special linear group of degree d over $\mathbb{Z}$, i.e., the set of matrices over $\mathbb{Z}$ whose determinant is 1. For $x_1, \ldots, x_d \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathrm{diag}(x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ denotes the diagonal matrix with $(x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ at the diagonal. For a vector $\boldsymbol{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_d)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1, \ldots, c_d)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define $[\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}] := \prod_{i=1}^d [b_i, c_i]$ and $\max(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}) := (\max(b_i, c_i))_{i=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and denote $\boldsymbol{b} \leq \boldsymbol{c}$ if $b_i \leq c_i$ holds for all $1 \leq i \leq d$.

2 Construction method of admissible lattices

One general construction scheme for admissible lattices is studied in Temlyakov [10, IV.4]. Let $p_d(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a d-dimensional polynomial with integer coefficients satisfying the following three properties: (i) its leading coefficient is 1, (ii) it is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$, (iii) it has different d real roots, say $\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_d \in \mathbb{R}$. With these roots, we define a Vandermonde matrix T by

$$T = (\zeta_i^{j-1})_{i,j=1}^d.$$

Then the lattice $T(\mathbb{Z})$ generated by T is admissible. Frolov used $q_d(x) = -1 + \prod_{j=1}^{d}(x - 2j + 1)$ in his paper [4]. Note that he originally used the lattice made from $q_d(x)$ not for T in (1) but for its dual lattice. However, later it is shown that $T(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ itself is admissible if and only if its dual lattice is admissible, see [9, Lemma 3.1] and also [14, Lemma 2.1] for a Vandermonde matrix. One disadvantage of the choice of q_d is that its roots are not given explicitly.

In [10] Temlyakov proposed to use the rescaled Chebyshev polynomials P_d as in (2) when $d = 2^n$ for a non-negative integer n. It is shown that P_d holds the condition (i) and (iii), and its roots are given as in (3). Further P_d is irreducible if and only if $d = 2^n$. Thus the Chebyshev-Frolov lattice, i.e., the lattice constructed as above with a use of $P_d(x)$, is admissible if and only if $d = 2^n$.

3 Enumeration of the Chebyshev-Frolov lattice points

3.1 Recursive property of generating matrices

Our considering Chebyshev-Frolov lattices are coordinate-permuted versions of the usual ones. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and put $d = 2^n$. We define $\sigma(n, k) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $1 \le k \le d$ recursively as $\sigma(0, 1) = 1$ and

$$\sigma(n+1, k) = \begin{cases} \sigma(n, k) & \text{if } 1 \le k \le d, \\ 2d + 1 - \sigma(n, k-d) & \text{if } d+1 \le k \le 2d. \end{cases}$$

For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $\sigma(n, \cdot)$ is a permutation on $\{1, \dots, d\}$, which is shown by induction on n as follows. The case $n = 0$ is trivial. We assume the lemma holds for n. By the definition of $\sigma(n+1, k)$ and induction assumption, $\sigma(n+1, \cdot)$ is a permutation on $\{1, \dots, d\}$ and also a permutation on $\{d+1, \dots, 2d\}$. This proves the result for $n + 1$.

We now define $\xi_{n,k} \in \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\xi_{n,k} = 2\cos\left(\frac{\pi(2\sigma(n,k) - 1)}{2d}\right) \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, d,$$

and consider a Vandermonde matrix $V_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as

$$V_n := (\xi_{n,i}^j)_{i,j=1}^d = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \xi_{n,1} & \cdots & \xi_{n,1}^{d-1} \\ 1 & \xi_{n,2} & \cdots & \xi_{n,2}^{d-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \xi_{n,d} & \cdots & \xi_{n,d}^{d-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Comparing $\xi_{n,k}$'s and $\zeta_{n,k}$'s defined as in (3), we find that $\xi_{n,k}$'s are also the roots of $P_d(x)$ since $\sigma(n, \cdot)$ is a permutation on $\{1, \dots, d\}$. Thus the lattice $V_n(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ is a coordinate permutation of the usual Chebyshev-Frolov lattice.

Further we define a diagonal matrix $D_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as

$$D_n := \mathrm{diag}(\xi_{n+1,1}, \ldots, \xi_{n+1,d}).$$

We are now ready to define a matrix $A_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ recursively as $A_0 = 1$ and

$$A_{n+1} = \begin{pmatrix} A_n & D_n A_n \\ A_n & -D_n A_n \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

The following lemma shows that A_n can be used as a generating matrix of the Chebyshev-Frolov lattices, i.e., $V_n(\mathbb{Z}^d) = A_n(\mathbb{Z}^d)$.

Lemma 3.1. *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $S_n \in \mathbb{Z}^{2^n \times 2^n}$ such that $\det S_n = \pm 1$ and $V_n S_n = A_n$.*

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on n. The case $n = 0$ is trivial since $V_0 = A_0 = 1$. Now we assume that the lemma holds for n and show for $n+1$. Put $d = 2^n$. Define a matrix $V'_{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ obtained by column swapping of V_{n+1} as

$$V'_{n+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \xi_{n+1,1}^2 & \cdots & \xi_{n+1,1}^{2(d-1)} & \xi_{n+1,1} & \xi_{n+1,1}^3 & \cdots & \xi_{n+1,1}^{2d-1} \\ 1 & \xi_{n+1,2}^2 & \cdots & \xi_{n+1,2}^{2(d-1)} & \xi_{n+1,2} & \xi_{n+1,2}^3 & \cdots & \xi_{n+1,2}^{2d-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \xi_{n+1,2d}^2 & \cdots & \xi_{n+1,2d}^{2(d-1)} & \xi_{n+1,2d} & \xi_{n+1,2d}^3 & \cdots & \xi_{n+1,2d}^{2d-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since V'_{n+1} is obtained by column swapping of V_{n+1}, there exists $W_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2d \times 2d}$ such that $\det W_{n+1} = \pm 1$ and $V'_{n+1} = V_{n+1} W_{n+1}$.

Define $U_n = (u_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^d \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times d}$ as

$$u_{i,j} = (-2)^{j-i} \binom{j-1}{i-1},$$

where $\binom{j}{i}$ is a binomial coefficient and is defined to be zero if $i > j$. Since U_n is upper-triangular and all the diagonal entries are 1, $U_n \in SL_d(\mathbb{Z})$ holds. We now compute $V'_{n+1} \begin{pmatrix} U_n & O \\ O & U_n \end{pmatrix}$. We have $\xi_{n+1,i+d} = -\xi_{n+1,i}$ for $1 \le i \le d$. Further, using the formula $\cos 2\theta = 2\cos^2\theta - 1$, we have $\xi_{n,i} = \xi_{n+1,i}^2 - 2 = \xi_{n+1,i+d}^2 - 2$ for $1 \le i \le d$ and thus $\xi_{n,i}^a = (\xi_{n+1,i}^2 - 2)^a = (\xi_{n+1,i+d}^2 - 2)^a$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus we have

$$V'_{n+1} \begin{pmatrix} U_n & O \\ O & U_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V_n & D_n V_n \\ V_n & -D_n V_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

By induction assumption, there exists $S_n \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times d}$ such that $\det S_n = \pm 1$ and $V_n S_n = A_n$. Hence

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_n & D_n V_n \\ V_n & -D_n V_n \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S_n & O \\ O & S_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_n & D_n A_n \\ A_n & -D_n A_n \end{pmatrix} = A_{n+1}.$$

Thus we have shown that $V_{n+1}S_{n+1} = A_{n+1}$ with

$$S_{n+1} = W_{n+1}\begin{pmatrix} U_n & O \\ O & U_n \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} S_n & O \\ O & S_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

This shows that the lemma holds for $n+1$. □

3.2 Recursive enumeration

In this subsection we give a recursive algorithm to obtain the Chebyshev-Frolov lattice points. We start with the definition of functions which is used to state Lemma 3.3 to reduce a 2^{n+1}-dimensional enumeration to 2^n-dimensional enumerations.

Definition 3.2. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d := 2^n$. Let $\boldsymbol{a}_1, \boldsymbol{b}_1, \boldsymbol{b}_2, \boldsymbol{c}_1, \boldsymbol{c}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\boldsymbol{b} = (\boldsymbol{b}_1; \boldsymbol{b}_2), \boldsymbol{c} := (\boldsymbol{c}_1; \boldsymbol{c}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. We define functions $\rho_n(\boldsymbol{b})$, $\phi_n(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c})$ and $\psi_n(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_n(\boldsymbol{b}) &= (\boldsymbol{b}_1 + \boldsymbol{b}_2)/2 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \phi_n(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}) &= D_n^{-1} \max(\boldsymbol{b}_1 - \boldsymbol{a}_1, -\boldsymbol{c}_2 + \boldsymbol{a}_1) \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \psi_n(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}) &= D_n^{-1} \min(\boldsymbol{c}_1 - \boldsymbol{a}_1, -\boldsymbol{b}_2 + \boldsymbol{a}_1) \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and put $d = 2^n$. Let $\boldsymbol{b}_1, \boldsymbol{b}_2, \boldsymbol{c}_1, \boldsymbol{c}_2, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and define $\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}, \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ as $\boldsymbol{b} = (\boldsymbol{b}_1; \boldsymbol{b}_2)$, $\boldsymbol{c} := (\boldsymbol{c}_1; \boldsymbol{c}_2)$ and $\boldsymbol{x} := (\boldsymbol{x}_1; \boldsymbol{x}_2)$. Then the inequality $\boldsymbol{b} \le A_{n+1}\boldsymbol{x} \le \boldsymbol{c}$ is equivalent to the simultaneous inequalities*

$$\begin{cases} \rho_n(\boldsymbol{b}) \le A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1 \le \rho_n(\boldsymbol{c}), & (5) \\ \phi_n(A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}) \le A_n\boldsymbol{x}_2 \le \psi_n(A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}). & (6) \end{cases}$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.1, $\boldsymbol{b} \le A_{n+1}\boldsymbol{x} \le \boldsymbol{c}$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{b}_1 \le A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1 + D_nA_n\boldsymbol{x}_2 \le \boldsymbol{c}_1, \\ \boldsymbol{b}_2 \le A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1 - D_nA_n\boldsymbol{x}_2 \le \boldsymbol{c}_2. \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

By adding the inequalities in (7) we have

$$\rho_n(\boldsymbol{b}) \le A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1 \le \rho_n(\boldsymbol{c}). \tag{8}$$

On the other hand, (7) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{b}_1 - A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1 \le D_nA_n\boldsymbol{x}_2 \le \boldsymbol{c}_1 - A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1, \\ -\boldsymbol{c}_2 + A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1 \le D_nA_n\boldsymbol{x}_2 \le -\boldsymbol{b}_2 + A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1, \end{cases}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\max(\boldsymbol{b}_1 - A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1, -\boldsymbol{c}_2 + A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1) \le D_nA_n\boldsymbol{x}_2 \le \min(\boldsymbol{c}_1 - A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1, -\boldsymbol{b}_2 + A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1).$$

Since D_n is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are positive, this inequality is equivalent to

$$\phi_n(A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}) \leq A_n\boldsymbol{x}_2 \leq \psi_n(A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}). \tag{9}$$

Thus we have

$$(7) \iff (7) \text{ and } (8) \iff (9) \text{ and } (8),$$

which is what we desired to prove. □

Remark 3.4. Assume that $\boldsymbol{b} \leq \boldsymbol{c}$. Then, for fixed $\boldsymbol{x}_1$ with (5), we can see that $\phi_n(A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}) \leq \psi_n(A_n\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c})$ and thus there exists $\boldsymbol{x}_2$ which satisfies (9).

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We define

$$\mathcal{P}_n(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}) := \{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \boldsymbol{b} \leq A_n\boldsymbol{k} \leq \boldsymbol{c}\}.$$

Lemma 3.3 implies the following theorem to give $\mathcal{P}_n(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c})$.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $d := 2^n$ and $\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Then we have*

$$\mathcal{P}_{n+1}(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{k}_1 \\ \boldsymbol{k}_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} \boldsymbol{k}_1 \in \mathcal{P}_n(\rho_n(\boldsymbol{b}), \rho_n(\boldsymbol{c})), \\ \boldsymbol{k}_2 \in \mathcal{P}_n(\phi_n(A_n\boldsymbol{k}_1, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}), \psi_n(A_n\boldsymbol{k}_1, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c})) \end{array} \right\}.$$

This theorem reduces an enumeration in dimension 2^{n+1} to enumerations in dimension 2^n. Further the case $n = 0$ is easy to solve, since $k \in \mathcal{P}_0(b, c)$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ is equivalent to $b \leq k \leq c$. This justifies Algorithm 1 to obtain the set $\mathcal{P}_n(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c})$.

Algorithm 1 Recursive algorithm to obtain the set $\mathcal{P}_n(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c})$

```
1: procedure SET(n, b, c)                          ▷ Output the set P_n(b, c)
2:     if n = 0 then
3:         return {k ∈ ℤ | ⌈b⌉ ≤ k ≤ ⌊c⌋}          ▷ In this case b and c are scalar
4:     else
5:         P ← empty set                            ▷ Initialize P as the empty set
6:         for all k_1 ∈ SET(n − 1, ρ_{n−1}(b), ρ_{n−1}(c)) do
7:             for all k_2 ∈ SET(n − 1, φ_{n−1}(A_{n−1}k_1, b, c), ψ_{n−1}(A_{n−1}k_1, b, c))
   do
8:                 append P ← (k_1; k_2)            ▷ Append a point to the set P
9:             end for
10:        end for
11:        return P
12:    end if
13: end procedure
```

3.3 Sequential enumeration

One disadvantage of Algorithm 1 is that it needs much memory. In this subsection, to defeat this disadvantage we derive simultaneous inequalities equivalent to $\boldsymbol{b} \leq A_n \boldsymbol{x} \leq \boldsymbol{c}$ by applying Lemma 3.3 repeatedly and then we give a sequential enumeration algorithm.

We begin with an illustration for the case $n = 2$. Fix $\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^4$ and let $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1; x_2; x_3; x_4)$. Our aim is to obtain simultaneous inequalities which are equivalent to $\boldsymbol{b} \leq A_2 \boldsymbol{x} \leq \boldsymbol{c}$. From Lemma 3.3, it is reduced to

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1,1} \leq A_1(x_1; x_2) \leq \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1,1}, & (10) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1,2} \leq A_1(x_3; x_4) \leq \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1,2}. & (11) \end{cases}$$

where we put $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1,1} := \rho_1(\boldsymbol{b})$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1,1} := \rho_1(\boldsymbol{c})$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1,2} := \phi_1(A_1(x_1; x_2), \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c})$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1,2} := \psi_1(A_1(x_1; x_2), \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c})$. Whereas $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1,2}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1,2}$ are not determined until x_1 and x_2 are fixed, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1,1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1,1}$ are determined using only $\boldsymbol{b}$ and $\boldsymbol{c}$. Hence we first consider (10). Again from Lemma 3.3, (10) is reduced to

$$\begin{cases} \beta_{0,1} \leq A_0 x_1 \leq \gamma_{0,1}, & (12) \\ \beta_{0,2} \leq A_0 x_2 \leq \gamma_{0,2}, & (13) \end{cases}$$

where we put $\beta_{0,1} := \rho_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1,1})$, $\gamma_{0,1} := \rho_0(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1,1})$, $\beta_{0,2} := \phi_0(A_0 x_1, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1,1}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1,1})$ and $\gamma_{0,2} := \psi_0(A_0 x_1, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1,1}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1,1})$. Whereas $\beta_{0,2}$ and $\gamma_{0,2}$ are not determined until x_1 is fixed, $\beta_{0,1}$ and $\gamma_{0,1}$ are determined using only $\boldsymbol{b}$ and $\boldsymbol{c}$. Thus we can fix x_1 satisfying (12). Once x_1 is fixed, $\beta_{0,2}$ and $\gamma_{0,2}$ are determined and thus we can fix x_2 with (13). Once x_2 is fixed, then $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1,2}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1,2}$ are determined, and again from Lemma 3.3, Inequality (11) is reduced to

$$\begin{cases} \beta_{0,3} \leq A_0 x_3 \leq \gamma_{0,3}, & (14) \\ \beta_{0,4} \leq A_0 x_4 \leq \gamma_{0,4}, & (15) \end{cases}$$

where we put $\beta_{0,3} := \rho_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1,2})$, $\gamma_{0,3} := \rho_0(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1,2})$, $\beta_{0,4} := \phi_0(A_0 x_3, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1,2}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1,2})$ and $\gamma_{0,4} := \psi_0(A_0 x_3, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1,2}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1,2})$. Now $\beta_{0,3}$ and $\gamma_{0,3}$ are determined and we can fix x_3 with (14). Once x_3 is fixed, $\beta_{0,4}$ and $\gamma_{0,4}$ are determined and thus we can fix x_4 with (15). In this way, we have shown that $\boldsymbol{b} \leq A_2 \boldsymbol{x} \leq \boldsymbol{c}$ is equivalent to the simultaneous inequalities (12)–(15), where $\beta_{0,1}$ and $\gamma_{0,1}$ are already determined and $\beta_{0,i}$ and $\gamma_{0,i}$ are determined when $x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}$ are fixed ($i = 2, 3, 4$). This equivalence allows us to implement the enumeration of the vectors $\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ with $\boldsymbol{b} \leq A_2 \boldsymbol{k} \leq \boldsymbol{c}$ by 4-folded for-loops or an equivalent tail-recursion.

We now generalize the procedure for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hereafter, to clarify which coordinates we consider, we use the following notation.

Definition 3.6. Let $n, L, a \in \mathbb{N}$ with $0 \leq L \leq n$, $1 \leq a \leq 2^{n-L}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Put $d' := 2^L$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{x}_{L,a} &:= (x_{(a-1)d'+1}, \ldots, x_{ad'})^\top \in \mathbb{Z}^{d'}, \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{L,a} &:= A_L \boldsymbol{x}_{L,a} \in \mathbb{R}^{d'}. \end{aligned}$$

Put $d := 2^n$ and fix $\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Our aim is to reduce $\boldsymbol{b} \leq A_n \boldsymbol{x}_{n,1} \leq \boldsymbol{c}$ to simultaneous 1-dimensional inequalities. Put $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n,1} := \boldsymbol{b}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{n,1} := \boldsymbol{c}$. From Lemma 3.3, for all $0 \leq L \leq n$, $1 \leq a \leq 2^{n-L}$ an inequality $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{L,a} \leq A_L \boldsymbol{x}_{L,a} \leq \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{L,a}$ is reduced to

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{L-1,2a-1} \leq A_n \boldsymbol{x}_{L-1,2a-1} \leq \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{L-1,2a-1}, \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_{L-1,2a} \leq A_n \boldsymbol{x}_{L-1,2a} \leq \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{L-1,2a}, \end{cases}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{L,a}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{L,a} \in \mathbb{R}^{2^L}$ are defined as

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{L-1,2a-1} = \rho_{L-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{L,a}), \tag{16}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{L-1,2a-1} = \rho_{L-1}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{L,a}), \tag{17}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{L-1,2a} = \phi_{L-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{L-1,2a-1}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{L,a}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{L,a}), \tag{18}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{L-1,2a} = \psi_{L-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{L-1,2a-1}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{L,a}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{L,a}). \tag{19}$$

We have seen that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{L,a}$'s, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{L,a}$'s and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{L,a}$'s depend on each other and some of them are not determined until some of k_i's are fixed. The dependence between $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{L,a}$'s are given as follows. For $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{2^L}$, define

$$\tau_{L+1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2) := (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1 + D_L \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1 - D_L \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{2^{L+1}}.$$

Then for $1 \leq L \leq n$ and $1 \leq a \leq 2^{n-L}$ it follows from (4) that

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{L,a} = \tau_L(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{L-1,2a-1}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{L-1,2a}). \tag{20}$$

We now study how those values are determined. We define the sets $\mathcal{A}_i$ and $\mathcal{B}_i$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq i \leq 2^n$ recursively as

$$\mathcal{A}_0 := \emptyset, \qquad \mathcal{B}_0 := \{(j, 1) \mid j \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq j \leq r\},$$

and, for $i = 2^r p$ where $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and p is an odd integer,

$$\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}_{i-1} \cup \{(j, 2^{r-j} p) \mid j \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq j \leq r\},$$
$$\mathcal{B}_i = \mathcal{B}_{i-1} \cup \{(j, 2^{r-j} p + 1) \mid j \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq j \leq r\}.$$

The following lemmas show that these sets control the determination of the values.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq i \leq 2^n$. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_i$ be fixed. If $(L, a) \in \mathcal{A}_i$ holds, then $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{L,a}$ is determined.*

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on i. If $i = 0$, we have nothing to prove. Now let $i = 2^r p > 0$ where $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and p is an odd integer and assume that the result holds for $i-1$. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_i$ be fixed. By induction assumption, for all $(L, a) \in \mathcal{A}_{i-1}$ the value $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{L,a}$ is determined. Thus it remains to show for $(L, a) \in \mathcal{A}_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{i-1}$. Since x_i is fixed, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{0,2^r p} = x_i$ is determined. Further, by induction assumption, for all $0 \leq j < r$ we have $(j, 2^{r-j} p - 1) \in \mathcal{A}_{2^r p - 2^j} \subset \mathcal{A}_{i-1}$ and thus $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{j,2^{r-j}p-1}$ is determined. By using these results and applying (20) repeatedly, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{j,2^{r-j}p}$ is sequentially determined for all $0 \leq j \leq r$. This proves the result for i. □

We remark that the lemma is directly shown as follows: The condition that $x_1, \dots, x_i$ are fixed implies that $\boldsymbol{x}_{L,a}$ is fixed for all $(L,a) \in \mathcal{A}_i$ and thus $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{L,a} = A_L \boldsymbol{x}_{L,a}$ is determined. The procedure shown in the proof, however, can save the cost to compute the values similarly to the fast-Fourier transform algorithm.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \le i < 2^n$. Let $x_1, \dots, x_i$ be fixed. If $(L,a) \in \mathcal{B}_i$ holds, then $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{L,a}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{L,a}$ are determined.*

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on i. First assume $i = 0$, i.e., none of x_j are fixed for $1 \le j \le 2^n$. Even then, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n,1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{n,1}$ are determined as $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n,1} = \boldsymbol{b}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{n,1} = \boldsymbol{c}$. Hence, using (16) and (17) repeatedly, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{j,1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j,1}$ are determined for all $0 \le j \le r$. This proves the result for $i = 0$.

Now we assume that the lemma holds for $i-1$. Let $x_1, \dots, x_i$ be fixed. By induction assumption, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{L,a}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{L,a}$ are determined for all $(L,a) \in \mathcal{B}_{i-1}$. Thus it remains to show for $(L,a) \in \mathcal{B}_i \setminus \mathcal{B}_{i-1}$. Lemma 3.7 implies that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{r,p}$ is determined. Further, by induction assumption we have $(r+1, (p+1)/2) \in \mathcal{B}_{2^r(p-1)} \subset \mathcal{B}_{i-1}$ and thus $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{r+1,(p+1)/2}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{r+1,(p+1)/2}$ are determined. Then $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{r,p+1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{r,p+1}$ are determined from these results, (18) and (19). Thus, by using (16) and (17) repeatedly, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{j,2^{r-j}p+1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j,2^{r-j}p+1}$ are determined for all $0 \le j \le r$. This proves the result for i. □

Lemma 3.8 implies that $(0, i+1) \in \mathcal{B}_i$, which means that $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,i+1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,i+1}$ are determined when $x_1, \dots, x_i$ are fixed. Thus we have shown the following equivalence in summary.

Theorem 3.9. *The inequality $\boldsymbol{b} \le A_n \boldsymbol{x} \le \boldsymbol{c}$ is equivalent to 2^n simultaneous inequalities*

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,i} \le x_i \le \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,i} \quad \text{for } 1 \le i \le 2^n,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,1}$ are already determined and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,i}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,i}$ are determined when $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$ are fixed, as in Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8.

Lemmas 3.7–3.8 and Theorem 3.9 allow Algorithm 2, an tail-recursive enumeration of all the Chebyshev-Frolov lattice points $A_n \boldsymbol{k}$ with $\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2^n}$ in the box $[\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}]$. Algorithm 2 is equivalent to 2^n-folded for-loops.

Remark 3.10. If you need only to approximate the integration value, replace Line 22 in Algorithm 2 by the evaluation of the integrand. You do not need to memorize any of the Chebyshev-Frolov lattice points.

4 Frolov's cubature formula and its randomization

In this section we revisit Frolov's cubature formula and its randomization, and in particular we show how to enumerate the integration nodes using Algorithm 2.

Let $\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a matrix $T \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ which generates an admissible lattice $T(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. We define the set

$$X(T, \boldsymbol{v}) := \{T(\boldsymbol{k} + \boldsymbol{v}) \mid \boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d\} \cap [-1/2, 1/2]^d$$

Algorithm 2 Enumerate the lattice points in the box $[\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}]$

procedure LatticePoints($n, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}$) ▷ The lattice points in the box
  for $i = 1$ to 2^n **do** ▷ Preparation for updating
    memory $r(i), p(i) \in \mathbb{N}$ as $i = 2^{r(i)}p(i)$
  end for ▷ Finish preparation
  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n,1} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{b}$ ▷ Update $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{L,a}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{L,a}$ with $\mathcal{B}_0$
  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{n,1} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{c}$
  for $j = n - 1$ to 0 **do**
    $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{j,1} \leftarrow \rho_j(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{j+1,1})$
    $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j,1} \leftarrow \rho_j(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j+1,1})$
  end for ▷ Finish updating
  Enum(1)
end procedure

function Enum(i) ▷ Enumerate the i-th coordinate k_i
  for $k_i = \lceil \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,i} \rceil$ to $\lfloor \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,i} \rfloor$ **do**
    if $i \neq 2^n$ **then**
      UpdateAlpha(i)
      UpdateBetaGamma(i)
      Enum($i + 1$)
    else ▷ That is, if $i = 2^n$
      UpdateAlpha(2^n)
      Output $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{n,1}$ ▷ $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{n,1} = A_n \boldsymbol{k}$ is a lattice point
    end if
  end for
end function

function UpdateAlpha(i) ▷ Update $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{L,a}$ with $\mathcal{A}_i$
  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{0,i} \leftarrow k_i$
  for $j = 1$ to $r(i)$ **do**
    $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{j,2^{r(i)-j}p(i)} \leftarrow \tau_j(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{j-1,2^{r(i)-j+1}p(i)-1}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{j-1,2^{r(i)-j+1}p(i)})$
  end for
end function

function UpdateBetaGamma(i) ▷ Update $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{L,a}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{L,a}$ with $\mathcal{B}_i$
  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{r(i),p(i)+1} \leftarrow \phi_{r(i)}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{r(i),p(i)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{r(i)+1,(p(i)+1)/2}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{r(i)+1,(p(i)+1)/2})$
  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{r(i),p(i)+1} \leftarrow \psi_{r(i)}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{r(i),p(i)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{r(i)+1,(p(i)+1)/2}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{r(i)+1,(p(i)+1)/2})$
  for $j = r(i) - 1$ to 0 **do**
    $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{j,2^{r(i)-j}p(i)+1} \leftarrow \rho_j(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{j+1,2^{r(i)-j-1}p(i)+1})$
    $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j,2^{r(i)-j}p(i)+1} \leftarrow \rho_j(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j+1,2^{r(i)-j-1}p(i)+1})$
  end for
end function

and the cubature rule for a function $f(\boldsymbol{x})$ on $[-1/2, 1/2]^d$ as

$$Q_{T,\boldsymbol{v}}(f) = |\det T| \sum_{x \in X(T,v)} f(\boldsymbol{x}).$$

As mentioned in the introduction, Frolov's cubature formula is of the form $Q(a^{-1}T, \mathbf{0})$ for $a > 1$. For the number of integration nodes, it is known from [9] that

$$\lim_{a \to \infty} \frac{|X(a^{-1}T, \mathbf{0})|}{\det(a^{-1}T)} = 1.$$

Following [6], we use scaled (and coordinate-permuted) Chebyshev-Frolov lattices as admissible lattices for Frolov's cubature formula. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let A_n be defined as in (4). For a scaling parameter $N \in \mathbb{R}$ with $N > 0$, we define the value $s(N) := (|\det(A_n)|N)^{-1/d}$ and the matrix

$$A_{n,N} := s(N) A_n,$$

which satisfies $|\det(A_{n,N})| = 1/N$. From Theorem 1.1, we have $|\det(A_n)| = (2d)^{d/2}/\sqrt{2}$. We consider Frolov's cubature formula as $Q(A_{n,N}, \mathbf{0})$ for $N \in \mathbb{N}$. To find the integration nodes, we can use Algorithm 2 and the bijection

$$\{A_n \boldsymbol{k} \mid \boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d\} \cap [\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}] \to X(A_{n,N}, \mathbf{0}), \quad \boldsymbol{x} \mapsto s(N)\boldsymbol{x},$$

where $\boldsymbol{b} := -s(N)^{-1}(1/2, \ldots, 1/2)^\top$ and $\boldsymbol{c} := -\boldsymbol{b} = s(N)^{-1}(1/2, \ldots, 1/2)^\top$.

Randomized Frolov's cubature formula was introduced by Krieg and Novak [7], and studied further by Ullrich [12]. Our algorithm introduced below follows the exposition in [12], but note that $A_{n,N}$ in this paper corresponds to $B_N^{-\top}$ in [12]. Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ be two independent random vectors that are uniformly distributed in $[1/2, 3/2]^d$ and $[0, 1]^d$, respectively. Let $U := \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{u})$. We define randomized Frolov's cubature formula M_N using $A_{n,N}$ as

$$M_N(f) := Q_{U^{-1}A_{n,N},\boldsymbol{v}}(f).$$

How can we enumerate the nodes of the formula $M_N(f)$? We have

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{x} \in X(U^{-1}A_{n,N}, \boldsymbol{v}) &\iff \boldsymbol{x} = U^{-1}A_{n,N}(\boldsymbol{k} + \boldsymbol{v}) \in [-1/2, 1/2]^d \\ &\iff A_n \boldsymbol{k} \in s(N)^{-1} U [-1/2, 1/2]^d - A_n \boldsymbol{v}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, with defining $\boldsymbol{h} := (1/2, \ldots, 1/2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\boldsymbol{b} = -s(N)^{-1}U\boldsymbol{h} - A_n\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\boldsymbol{c} = s(N)^{-1}U\boldsymbol{h} - A_n\boldsymbol{v}$, we have the following bijective map

$$\{A_n \boldsymbol{k} \mid \boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d\} \cap [\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c}] \to X(U^{-1}A_{n,N}, \boldsymbol{v}), \quad \boldsymbol{x} \mapsto s(N)U^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x} + A_n\boldsymbol{v}).$$

Thus we can use Algorithm 2 to enumerate the nodes of randomized Frolov's cubature formula. We remark that the vector $A_n\boldsymbol{v}$ can be quickly computed, similarly to the computation of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{n,1}$.

5 Numerical efficiency of the algorithm

In this section we show the efficiency of Algorithm 2. Based on Algorithm 2, we counted the number of the nodes of Frolov's cubature formula using the Chebyshev-Frolov lattices, for dimensions $d = 2, 4, 8, 16, 32$ and for the scaling parameter $N = 2^m$ with $m = 1, \ldots, 30$. More precisely, we replaced Line 22 in Algorithm 2 by incrementing a counter for the number of the nodes. The code we used can be found at `https://github.com/tttyoyoyttt/the_Chebyshev_Frolov_lattice_points`. We conducted the experiments on Intel Core i7-4790 3.60GHz CPU. Our codes are implemented in C and compiled by GCC 4.9.3 with -O2 optimization flag on Windows 7. We used windows.h for getting the execution time.

The result is summarized in Tables 1–2, which show the number of the nodes and the execution time. We can enumerate the nodes for $d = 16$, $N = 2^{20}$ in less than 1 second. We can see that, for a fixed dimension d, the execution time increases linearly with respect to the scaling parameter N. On the other hand, for a fixed N, the execution time increases rapidly with respect to d. We can also see that the scaling parameter N does not well approximate the number of nodes when $d = 32$, for $N \leq 2^{30}$. Hence we suggest to use the formula when $d \leq 16$.

We have to remark on the accuracy of Algorithm 2. It requires many floating-point arithmetic operations, so it might have some errors. Indeed, if we use single-precision instead of double-precision, the number of the enumerated points sometimes differs (for example, for $d = 4$ and $N = 2^{24}$). In order to check the accuracy of Algorithm 2, we conducted another experiment. We first enumerated all the points in the box with the scaling parameter $2N$. Then, for each point, we checked whether it is included in the box with the scaling parameter N. We confirm that the number of the enumerated points by this algorithm coincides with that as in Tables 1–2. We also confirm that they coincide with the result in [8, Appendix], which gives those for $d = 2, 4, 8, 16$ and $N = 4^m$ with $3 \leq m \leq 10$. We remark that if we miscounted the integration nodes by the numerical error it would not be critical for Frolov's cubature formula since such miscounted points would be very close to the edge of the box and thus their function evaluations would be close to zero.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Christopher Kacwin, Mario Ullrich and Tino Ullrich for their valuable comments about the theory and experiments for Frolov's cubature formula.

References

[1] V. V. Dubinin. Optimal quadrature formulas for classes of functions with a bounded mixed difference. *Mat. Zametki*, 49(1):149–151, 1991.

Table 1: The number of the nodes of Chebyshev-Frolov's cubature formula and the execution time for $N = 2^m$ with $m = 1. \ldots, 30$ and $d = 2, 4, 8$ are given. We denote $\log_2 N$ by $\mathrm{lb}N$.

	$d = 2$		$d = 4$		$d = 8$	
$\mathrm{lb}N$	nodes	time(sec)	nodes	time(sec)	nodes	time(sec)
1	3	0.000008	5	0.000012	19	0.000019
2	5	0.000001	5	0.000001	19	0.000005
3	7	0.000001	11	0.000002	23	0.000007
4	15	0.000001	15	0.000002	27	0.000008
5	31	0.000001	31	0.000003	45	0.000014
6	65	0.000001	71	0.000004	79	0.000021
7	131	0.000001	123	0.000006	167	0.000034
8	257	0.000002	261	0.000009	271	0.000053
9	513	0.000005	513	0.000016	529	0.000092
10	1027	0.000007	1025	0.000028	1067	0.000159
11	2049	0.000012	2049	0.000048	2107	0.000282
12	4095	0.000022	4099	0.000083	4113	0.000501
13	8191	0.000042	8201	0.000149	8283	0.000891
14	16383	0.000082	16385	0.000272	16413	0.001580
15	32767	0.000160	32775	0.000492	32823	0.002782
16	65539	0.000314	65533	0.000910	65645	0.005053
17	131075	0.000610	131095	0.001682	131183	0.009033
18	262145	0.001205	262143	0.003110	262263	0.016504
19	524289	0.002393	524281	0.005838	524341	0.030049
20	1048579	0.005123	1048609	0.011248	1048779	0.055015
21	2097153	0.009583	2097143	0.021416	2097107	0.100984
22	4194307	0.018736	4194355	0.041369	4194399	0.186696
23	8388611	0.036209	8388589	0.080187	8388843	0.347014
24	16777215	0.072445	16777221	0.156289	16777535	0.642543
25	33554429	0.144748	33554439	0.307664	33554807	1.201434
26	67108861	0.288265	67108867	0.599280	67108777	2.250724
27	134217727	0.577065	134217723	1.178398	134217783	4.233333
28	268435457	1.151628	268435461	2.325093	268435889	8.002449
29	536870913	2.322550	536870913	4.598802	536871467	15.178914
30	1073741827	4.603653	1073741807	9.105867	1073742019	28.899540

Table 2: The number of the nodes of Chebyshev-Frolov's cubature formula and the execution time for $N = 2^m$ with $m = 1\ldots, 30$ and $d = 16, 32$ are given. We denote $\log_2 N$ by $\mathrm{lb}N$.

	$d = 16$		$d = 32$	
$\mathrm{lb}N$	nodes	time(sec)	nodes	time(sec)
1	77	0.000085	3377	0.019404
2	127	0.000097	4105	0.025259
3	151	0.000120	5041	0.034484
4	223	0.000182	6371	0.047148
5	295	0.000260	8915	0.068023
6	423	0.000388	11867	0.096804
7	539	0.000569	15291	0.141802
8	967	0.000963	20651	0.211015
9	1377	0.001565	29215	0.323648
10	2043	0.002452	42323	0.493032
11	3503	0.004050	61997	0.758875
12	5835	0.007013	88645	1.169238
13	10451	0.011678	128269	1.841059
14	18901	0.020136	186749	2.896117
15	36085	0.034897	278961	4.625915
16	69353	0.060682	430037	7.443627
17	136839	0.107031	679287	12.120136
18	267257	0.188353	1102547	20.047800
19	530333	0.334023	1799443	33.024893
20	1054837	0.593132	2990409	55.098279
21	2106165	1.062962	5079585	92.828770
22	4207997	1.909237	8757305	156.728010
23	8402385	3.446778	15442557	265.686566
24	16797845	6.234337	27637841	454.624777
25	33577467	11.324212	50306689	782.351191
26	67135425	20.618313	92921093	1351.141660
27	134246629	37.640596	173897749	2343.257467
28	268458047	68.951316	328647641	4087.063698
29	536891351	126.640419	627372745	7152.910717
30	1073829043	233.271579	1208920345	12553.435467

[2] V. V. Dubinin. Cubature formulas for Besov classes. *Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat.*, 61(2):27–52, 1997.

[3] Dinh Dũng, Vladimir N. Temlyakov, and Tino Ullrich. Hyperbolic cross approximation, 2016. arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.03978 [math.NA].

[4] K. K. Frolov. Upper bounds for the errors of quadrature formulae on classes of functions. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 231(4):818–821, 1976.

[5] Christopher Kacwin. Realization of the Frolov cubature formula via orthogonal Chebyshev-Frolov lattices. Master's thesis, Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftliche Fakultät der Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, 2016. `http://wissrech.ins.uni-bonn.de/teaching/master/masterthesis_kacwin.pdf`.

[6] Christopher Kacwin, Jens Oettershagen, and Tino Ullrich. On the orthogonality of the Chebyshev-Frolov lattice and applications, 2016. arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.00492 [math.NA].

[7] David Krieg and Erich Novak. A Universal Algorithm for Multivariate Integration. Found. Comput. Math. (2016). doi:10.1007/s10208-016-9307-y.

[8] Van Kien Nguyen, Mario Ullrich, and Tino Ullrich. Change of variable in spaces of mixed smoothness and numerical integration of multivariate functions on the unit cube, 2015. arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.02036 [math.NA].

[9] M. M. Skriganov. Constructions of uniform distributions in terms of geometry of numbers. *Algebra i Analiz*, 6(3):200–230, 1994.

[10] V. N. Temlyakov. *Approximation of periodic functions*. Computational Mathematics and Analysis Series. Nova Science Publishers, Inc., Commack, NY, 1993.

[11] V. N. Temlyakov. Cubature formulas, discrepancy, and nonlinear approximation. *J. Complexity*, 19(3):352–391, 2003.

[12] Mario Ullrich. A Monte Carlo method for integration of multivariate smooth functions I: Sobolev spaces, 2016. arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.06008 [math.NA].

[13] Mario Ullrich. On "Upper error bounds for quadrature formulas on function classes" by K. K. Frolov. In Ronald Cools and Dirk Nuyens, editors, *Monte Carlo and quasi-Monte Carlo methods 2014*, volume 163 of *Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, pages 571–582. Springer, Heidelberg, 2016.

[14] Mario Ullrich and Tino Ullrich. The role of Frolov's cubature formula for functions with bounded mixed derivative. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 54(2):969–993, 2016.